

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application and stand rejected.

Claim 1-11, 13-14, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elgebaly et al. (US Patent No. 7,272,650).

Claims 12, 15, 20, and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgebaly et al., in view of Caslin et al. (US Patent No. 7,197,560).

Claim 21 is objected to as depending from a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form incorporating all intervening limitations.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 14-15, 20-21, and 26-27 are amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the application. For example, among other places, support can be found at paragraphs [0020]-[0030] and with reference to binding elements 106i and 106ii illustrated in Fig. 1. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under Section 102

Claim 1 recites a system for providing network access translation device traversal. As claimed, "the NAT device creates a first binding for communication with a registration port of the first SIP client in response to registration information sent from the first SIP client to the proxy server...the proxy server provides registration information...to the second SIP client and forwards at least one command from the second SIP client to the first SIP client using the first binding, and...the communication session bypasses the proxy server and traverses the NAT device in accordance with a second binding between the registration port of the first SIP client and a port of the second SIP client." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not disclose at least these features.

Elgebaly discusses a system for operating communication protocols through a NAT device. As shown in Fig. 5, device EP1 registers its availability for communication with registration server 504 using a first port A1/P1. When second device EP2 initiates a call, device EP1 chooses a different port A1/P20 for conducting the call. See, Elgebaly at col. 5, lines 47-54. In other words, port A1/P20 which carries the call is different from port A1/P1 used for

registration. As a result, even though device EP2 initiated the call, it must wait for device EP1 to send data on new port A1/P20 so as to "prime" that port before communications can proceed.

See, Elgebaly at col. 5, lines 51-61.

By contrast, claim 1 recites "the NAT device creates a first binding for communication with a *registration port* of the first SIP client" and that communication between the first and second SIP clients "bypasses the proxy server and traverses the NAT device in accordance with a second binding between the *registration port* of the first SIP client and a port of the second SIP client" (emphasis added). Elgebaly's system thus differs from claim 1 both in terms of its resource requirements and in the way that communication between the devices is conducted. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Elgebaly does not disclose at least the features recited above and that it does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Independent claims 7, 14, and 20 each recite limitations similar to those discussed in connection with claim 1 and each is therefore believed allowable over Elgebaly for at least the reasons previously given. Regarding the dependent claims: claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claim 8-11 and 13 depend from claim 7, and claims 16-19 depend from claim 14. Each dependent claim incorporates all of the limitations of its respective base claim. Accordingly, each of the dependent claims is believed to be allowable over Elgebaly for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable base claim.

Rejections under Section 103

Claims 12, 15, 20, and 22-30 are rejected as unpatentable over Elgebaly in view of Caslin. As understood from the Office Action, Caslin is cited for aspects of command forwarding and communication. Applicants respectfully submit that Caslin does not cure Elgebaly's deficiencies as previously discussed.

In particular, Caslin discusses use of a SIP INVITE message for purposes of tracking down possible locations of a user with whom communication is sought. See, Caslin at col. 8, lines 19-51. Caslin does not teach or suggest NAT traversal, much less NAT traversal as specifically recited in the claims. Accordingly, whether taken alone or in combination,

Applicants respectfully submit that Elgebaly and Caslin do not teach or suggest each and every claimed element and they therefore do not render the claims obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Raney
Reg. No. 58,317

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 415-576-0300
SAR:djb
61251587 v1